

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 are pending. By this Amendment, Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 are amended. Support for the claim amendments can be found in the application as originally filed. See e.g., paragraphs [0071]-[0077], [0149]-[0155] and Figures 1-4. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is presented herein.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph. Applicants have amended the claims in a manner believed to be responsive to the rejection. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 1, 2, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Applicant Number 2002/0017433 to Nakashima et al. (Nakashima). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the following reason(s).

To qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, each and every feature of a rejected claim must taught by the applied art of record. Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 each recite, among other features, analyzing the displacement value to compute “a reaction force” (Claims 1 and 2) or “a target value” (Claims 5 and 6). Applicants respectfully submit that Nakashima fails to teach or suggest such a feature.

The Examiner asserts that the above features are taught by Nakashima and cites Nakashima, paragraph [0042] as support. Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, the

cited passage neither discloses nor suggests the invention. The cited paragraph discloses "limit switches for detecting a position of the detection arm" while making no reference to using displacement values to compute "a reaction force" or "a deviation from a target value" as is recited in the claim language.

For the reason(s) provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that Nakashima does not anticipate or render obvious the invention recited by Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 should be deemed allowable over Nakashima. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Attorney Docket Number 028359.00001.**

Respectfully submitted,


Anthony R. Morris
Registration No. 59,941

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000 Fax: (202) 638-4810